Epilogue

The Changing Concept of World Literature

Zhang Longxi

Most discussions of world literature mention, at some point or other, the German term "*Weltliteratur*" and trace the origin of the concept to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe. Though Goethe was not the first to use that term in German, given his great reputation and influence on the European cultural scene in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries, as John Pizer remarks, "it is Goethe to whom credit must be given for creating the paradigm that became a significant, widely debated element in critical and pedagogical literary discourse."[1] Pizer helpfully situates Goethe's concept in its historical context, in which Germany was not politically unified and all European nations, after the divisive Napoleonic Wars, were badly in need of mutual understanding and peaceful coexistence. In some sense, that was a situation not so very different from our world today, in which globalizing tendencies in economics, communication, and scientific and technological development coexist with many communities' intensifying grasp on ethnic or national identities, even the resurgence of a tenacious tribalism.

Theoretically speaking, the tension between two opposite forces has always resided in *Weltliteratur* as a concept, which stands poised between the local and the global, national specificities and cosmopolitan claims to literary universality. With regard to Goethe's own understanding, some have questioned whether his

Zhang Longxi is Chair Professor of Comparative Literature and Translation at City University of Hong Kong. He is a foreign member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities, a member of the executive councils of the International Comparative Literature Association and the Institute for World Literature, and an Advisory Editor of *New Literary History*. His books include *The Tao and the Logos: Literary Hermeneutics, East and West* (1992), *Allegoresis: Reading Canonical Literature East and West* (2005), *Unexpected Affinities: Reading across Cultures* (2007), and *An Introduction to Comparative Literature* (2009, in Chinese).

World Literature in Theory, First Edition. Edited by David Damrosch.

idea of *Weltliteratur* was actually limited to European literature only, or whether his cosmopolitan concept was contradictory to his emphasis on the important role Germans should play in its formation. To tip the balance of Goethe's concept to the side of German nationalism or Eurocentrism, however, not only ignores Goethe's own positive take on *Weltliteratur*, but is simply anachronistic and wrong. First of all, for Goethe, what was German was not national, but fragmented and divergent, tied together only by a shared language; and second, what was national was not opposed to what he thought to be universal. "It is evident that the best poets and writers of all nations have for some time been concentrating their efforts on universal human concerns," wrote Goethe in 1828 when commenting on Thomas Carlyle's *German Romance*, but "we increasingly see a writer's national and individual characteristics illuminated from within by these universal concerns."[2] In a letter to Count Stolberg, dated June 11, 1827, Goethe clearly stated that "Poetry is cosmopolitan, and the more interesting the more it shows its nationality."[3]

Interestingly, as Pizer shows in the essay included in this volume, it takes a critic from Africa, the Moroccan-born Germanist Fawzi Boubia, to recognize this and "establish the genuinely global dimensions of Goethe's Weltliteratur postulations and foreground their seminal and precocious embrace of alterity in the hermeneutic dialogue among the world's literatures" (p. 28 above). In fact, almost 30 years ago, Claudio Guillén already said as much when he urged us to "remember that Goethe started from the existence of some national literatures – thus making possible a dialogue between the local and the universal, between the one and the many, a dialogue that from that day to this has continued to breathe life into the best comparative studies."[4] Earlier still, René Etiemble argued, in 1974, that Goethe's elevation "of *Weltliteratur* implicitly condemns German nationalism and, with it, all nationalism" (p. 87 above). The suspicion of Eurocentrism reveals a sensibility of our own time, but to Goethe's mind, the either/or dichotomy between the local and the global, or the national and the universal, would probably be quite alien. Great works of literature always take root in particular linguistic, cultural, and national traditions, but they are at the same time capable of transcending the limitations of the local and the parochial to reach readers beyond the boundaries of their provenance, either in original forms or in successful translations.

More importantly, it was in his conversation with Johann Peter Eckermann that Goethe first developed his idea of Weltliteratur in the context of reflecting on poetic production in Asia, and in considering that China in particular enjoyed a flourishing literary culture when Europeans "were still living in the woods" (p. 19 above). Indeed, it was in talking about his reading of a Chinese novel in translation that Goethe made the famous announcement that "poetry is the universal possession of mankind. … National literature is now rather an unmeaning term; the epoch of World-literature is at hand, and every one must strive to hasten its approach" (pp. 19–20). It is true that Goethe argued for returning to the ancient Greeks for patterns of European literature, but his concept of *Weltliteratur* did open up to non-Western literatures, and *that* constitutes the paradigmatic sense which renders Goethe's concept more relevant to our time than to his own.

As Richard Meyer argued in 1900, Goethe's concept was "future-oriented," a concept that "had just dawned" in his time.[5] It is in our time, when literary scholars everywhere have a much stronger sense of the global connectedness of nations and peoples, a much greater need to open one's eyes beyond the tunnel vision of one's own group or community, and a much greater readiness to embrace alterity beyond one's linguistic and cultural comfort zones, that Goethe's concept of *Weltliteratur* may have found a better condition than ever before to make a real impact on the ways we think globally about literature, culture, tradition, and ultimately about the world in which we live.

Goethe talked about *Weltliteratur* in the 1820s, and the term was picked up again by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in the *Communist Manifesto* of 1848, where, in describing the global tendencies propelled by the fast growth of world capitalism, they saw world literature as a cultural phenomenon inevitably superseding national literatures. If Goethe's vision was a humanistic one, Marx conceptualized world literature as part of a global tendency closely related to economic and political developments at the time. Goethe's and Marx's concepts of world literature have been understood differently by different scholars. "That phrase 'world literature,' and the vision that the creation of such a thing was desirable," says Aijid Ahmad, "Marx had taken from his favorite poet, Goethe," even though Marx "associated the creation of 'world literature' not with the self-activity of a high-minded intelligentsia or as a mode of exchange among the principal classicisms, which is more or less what Goethe had in mind, but as an objective process inherent in other kinds of globalisation where modes of cultural exchange follow closely upon patterns of political economy."[6] In Mads Rosendahl Thomsen's understanding, however, Goethe's notion of world literature was an "idealistic vision of the symphony of the masterpieces from different nations," while Marx's concept was a "more cynical vision of global distribution of books as commodities."[7]

Goethe and Marx surely conceived of *Weltliteratur* differently, but given Marx's conviction that history is an evolutionary process of progress, a Hegelian kind of development from a lower to a higher form, his remarks on capitalism and the bourgeois production of world literature are not as negative as some contemporary commentators would have us to believe. For Marx, it was only to the extent that capitalism was to be superseded by a yet higher stage of social and historical development – socialism and communism – that capitalism was negative, but negative in the Hegelian sense of *Aufhebung*, that is, negating the limitations of capitalism but preserving all it would have achieved as a necessary stage of human history and social progress. For Marx, capitalism in its own right was better than the feudalist medieval society and definitely higher than the Asiatic mode of production, the agrarian societies in China and in Asia at large, which in his view represented a more primitive stage of social development. So when Marx declared the demise of national literatures, he was very much in agreement with Goethe in looking at *Weltliteratur* as a new and progressive phenomenon: "National one-sidedness and narrow-mindedness become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures there arises a world literature."[8]

This famous statement from the *Communist Manifesto* is not at all a negative evaluation. On the contrary, Marx and Engels saw the globalizing tendency of world capitalism as a necessary prerequisite condition for the socialist revolution, and hence the slogan, repeated later by all political publications in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries: "Workers of all countries, unite!" The working class, in their understanding, was a global force of revolution, not bounded by national affiliations. The socialist movement was an international one, and the Communist International was based on that global idea. So in that sense, Marx's idea was not an antidote to Goethe's, though he understood world literature as the cultural aspect of the mode of production under global capitalism, rather than as the humanistic appreciation of the major works of the world's different literary and cultural traditions.

Since Goethe's time, the concept of world literature has always been a somewhat flexible and changing idea, not a rigid fixation on a set of canonical works. The various selections in this volume reflect the many changes and different understandings, and a number of questions become central to our rethinking of world literature at the present time. First, the scope or coverage of world literature must be significantly large. The importance of such cultural cartography is already prominent in Goethe's concept, for it was Persian poetry and a Chinese novel he read in translation that brought *Weltliteratur* to its global dimension. As a discipline, comparative literature also started out as an effort to break away from the constraints of national literatures and their attendant monolingual limitations, but in practice it remained largely a European operation. Franco Moretti puts it bluntly: "comparative literature has not lived up" to *Weltliteratur* as Goethe and Marx had in mind. "It's been a much more modest intellectual enterprise, fundamentally limited to Western Europe, and mostly revolving around the river Rhine (German philologists working on French literature)" (p. 160 above). That was why Etiemble wanted to revisit Goethe's *Weltliteratur* as an alternative to comparative literature despite the latter's cosmopolitan intention and emphasis on polyglottism. "The time is over when the Hungarian savant Hugo von Meltzl, a disciple of Goethe and advocate of *Weltliteratur*, could still propose a *Dekaglottismus* as the languages of civilization: German, English, Spanish, Dutch, Hungarian, Icelandic, Italian, Portuguese, Swedish and French – to which he added Latin," says Etiemble, because outside these European languages, literatures in Sanskrit, Chinese, Japanese, Indian, Persian, and Arabic had produced masterpieces "when most of the literatures of the *Dekaglottismus* either did not exist, or were still in their infancy" (p. 88, above).[9]

Etiemble commented on a number of German and French anthologies and bibliographies of world literature and found them woefully ignorant of major works of non-Western literatures. Most of those early anthologies, as Sarah Lawall has observed, were predicated on the Darwinian theories of social and cultural evolution and "saw themselves as illustrating the rise of civilization to its current apogee in Western culture and transmitting the moral lessons of that rise."[10] The influential *Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces* did not include more non-Western works until it came out in an "expanded" edition in 1995.

Things have since changed dramatically, and the rise of world literature can be seen as coeval with changes in social, economic, and political spheres in an increasingly globalized world. By now we may assume that the "world" in world literature has to be truly global or, to borrow a term recently made popular, it should be planetary, in a geographical sense. That is to say, when discussing world literature, the sampling of literary works must cross over not only languages and cultures, but also regions and continents, beyond Eurocentrism or any other ethnocentrism.

The mere expansion of coverage, the conglomeration of different literatures, however, does not make a meaningful concept of world literature. The sheer quantity of works available makes it impossible for anyone to read even a small portion of the world's literatures, so world literature as a concept has to be a theoretical construct, rather than a mere juxtaposition of literatures as textual materials. As Moretti argues, simply reading "more" is not enough. "It has to be different. The *categories* have to be different." The solution he proposes is "distant reading," which "allows you to focus on units that are much smaller or much larger than the text: devices, themes, tropes – or genres and systems" (p. 160, above). Many have responded to Moretti's theoretical model, but few have pointed out the similarity between the strategy of "distant reading" and Northrop Frye's archetypal criticism, which treats literature as a total structure or system rather than individual works randomly amalgamated together. Moretti's model, however, has a different political underpinning than Frye's. Drawing on Immanuel Wallerstein's "world-systems" theory and Fredric Jameson's "law of literary evolution," Moretti argues that the modern novel develops from European centers of metropolitan culture to non-European peripheries, "as a compromise between a western formal influence (usually French or English) and local materials" (p. 163). Despite its remarkable explanatory power, the center–periphery model and, for that matter, the world-systems theory on which it depends fail to recognize the resilience of local traditions that constitute crucial internal contexts, not just "local materials," for the development of the novel in the peripheries. In other words, the tension between the local and the global in the concept of world literature cannot be resolved by ignoring the local dimension, though as a *modern* form of literature, the novel in the peripheries is indeed under a heavy Western influence. In the case of the Chinese novel, for example, influential movers of the May Fourth new culture movement in the early twentieth century, radical iconoclastic figures like Lu Xun and Hu Shih, also looked to China's past in addition to the West. Lu Xun wrote one of the earliest histories of the classical Chinese novel, and Hu Shih advocated the re-examination of China's classical tradition and revolutionized the study of the great eighteenth-century Chinese novel *Hong Lou Meng* (*Dream of the Red Chamber*, also known as *The Story of the Stone*), which remains a major influence on most modern Chinese writers.

Focusing on the modern form does create problems with implications not only of a historical but also of a theoretical nature. This is particularly evident in the case of Pascale Casanova's idea of the "world republic of letters." Describing

the formation of the world's literary space "as the product of a historical process," she maintains that

> it appeared in Europe in the 16th century, France and England forming its oldest regions. It was consolidated and enlarged into central and eastern Europe during the 18th and especially the 19th centuries, propelled by Herderian national theory. It expanded throughout the 20th century, notably through the still-ongoing decolonization process: manifestos proclaiming the right to literary existence or independence continue to appear, often linked to movements for national self-determination. (p. 195, above)

Such an account of the history of world literature is unabashedly Eurocentric and modernist, closely mapping on the European expansion in the colonialist era and the subsequent decolonization in the mid-twentieth century, but completely oblivious of the Hellenistic and Roman world and ignorant of the formation of literary constellations outside Europe, such as the Persian and the Ottoman empires, or the East Asian region with the Chinese written language and culture playing a pivotal role in premodern times. Casanova's Paris-centered model, as Alexander Beecroft remarks, "cannot account for the full range of literary production across all cultures and times. … Forms of literary circulation which predate French literary culture, or which exist outside it today, have no real place in Casanova's world-system" (p. 182, above). Aamir Mufti also criticizes Casanova for missing the "philological revolution" in Oriental studies, when "non-Western textual traditions made their first entry *as literature*, sacred and secular, into the international literary space that had emerged in early modern times in Europe" (p. 315, above). Because of such blind spots, Mufti continues, Casanova fails to see non-Western literatures in world literary space until the middle of the twentieth century, as a result of decolonization, when "such figures as Kateb Yacine, V.S. Naipaul, and Salman Rushdie and the psychology of *assimilation* into metropolitan languages and cultures typify the non-Western writer" (p. 315). The formation of Casanova's world literary space thus looks like a process of radiation of European influence, and more specifically Parisian influence, onto the rest of the world, but it is important to realize that though Paris may have been the capital of the Western republic of letters at a certain period of time, such a mapping of world literary space is neither historically accurate nor theoretically productive. It may even smack of a kind of cultural narcissism known to be particularly strong in certain French intellectual circles.

The debate on the manifesto "*Pour une littérature-monde en français*" is noteworthy in this regard, as it reveals the complex relationships of the French language and literature with colonialism and decolonization. Signed by 44 writers, mostly originating from outside France, and published in *Le Monde* on March 16, 2007, the manifesto announced "the end of 'francophone' literature. And the birth of a world literature in French" (p. 272, above). It is an effort to destabilize the center and peripheries and calls for the equality of all writers writing in French, whether hexagonal or francophone. "With the center placed on an equal plane with other

centers," the signatories conclude in an idealistic vein, "we're witnessing the birth of a new constellation, in which language freed from its exclusive pact with the nation, free from every other power hereafter but the powers of poetry and the imaginary, will have no other frontiers but those of the spirit" (pp. 274–275). As his response to the manifesto shows, the soon-to-be French President, Nicolas Sarkozy, considers that francophonie is alive and well, a testimony to the influence of the French language from the center to the peripheries – a direct reversal of the direction celebrated in the manifesto itself. Yet Françoise Lionnet points out an irony in the fact that the manifesto, signed in Paris to destabilize the center in the very center itself, "reinforces by the same token the city's role as a site of cultural prestige that can grant distinction and visibility to writers in accordance to the regulatory principles of literary modernity with their well-established systems of coveted awards" (p. 297, above).

Perhaps there is a yet deeper irony concerning another tension, briefly revealed in Sarkozy's defense of the francophone, namely, the rivalry between French and English as lingua franca for world literature. This seems to be an issue too embarrassingly sensitive to be discussed in much of the debate on the manifesto of *littérature-monde français*, but it leads toward what Casanova holds as the "primary characteristic of this world literary space," namely, "hierarchy and inequality" (p. 200). Casanova's sober-minded, realpolitik view of the world literary space has the virtue of presenting the modern and contemporary world in a clear picture, not obscured by a sentimental moralism. "The unequal distribution of literary resources is fundamental to the structure of the entire world literary space, organized as it is around two opposing poles" (p. 201). For Casanova, the two poles are European metropolitan centers and non-European peripheries, but even within European centers, the distribution of cultural and symbolic capitals is likewise unequal, particularly between English and French as they compete for linguistic prestige. In a world that is increasingly globalized and also increasingly diversified, English has long evolved beyond England into a language widely used in social, economical, cultural, and all other aspects of contemporary life, and journals like *World Englishes* are published to discuss the legitimacy of diverse usages. The French language, in contrast, still retains its traditional prestige and centrality yet to be drastically diversified, and therefore the *littérature-monde* movement, as Dutton remarks, may be moving to "a new model that is potentially just as fraught with risk as francophonie" (p. 283). The question is: Is a world literature in French a real alternative to the center–periphery dichotomy with its dubious colonial implications?

The importance of translation as an affirmative force and not merely an unhappy necessity is certainly something new in the concept of world literature. In opening up to translations, world literature differs from comparative literature with its traditional requirement of near-native proficiency in French, German, and Latin. Traditional elite comparative literature programs, as David Damrosch observes, "had a real distaste for translation" (p. 366 above). Thomas Greene in his 1975 ACLA "Report on Standards" considered "the association of comparative literature with literatures in translation" as "the most disturbing" sign of the slackening of disciplinary

rigor and standards. "Greene's critique hit home," says Damrosch. "No self-respecting program in his day could wish to be seen as the educational equivalent of the food court in 'the Mall of America'" (p. 368). Perhaps by pure serendipity, "the food court of a mall" is precisely the metaphor Stephen Owen used in his critique of "world poetry," which flattens out regional differences and offers different cuisines as national types, as representatives of food (or literature) that lack "distinct histories and distinct values" (p. 252, above). As a Sinologist and specialist of classical Chinese poetry, Owen's critique a dozen years ago of the modern Chinese poet Bei Dao, who once wrote about democracy and oppression, proved to be misplaced and controversial, for he accused the Chinese poet of "using one's victimization for self-interest: in this case, to sell oneself abroad by what an international audience, hungry for political virtue, which is always in short supply, finds touching."[11] But when oppression and the struggle for democracy form part of the "distinct histories and distinct values" for the modern Chinese, Owen has no legitimate reason to dismiss these as inadmissible in modern Chinese poetry. In the essay included in this volume, however, he raises a pressing question of the world literature "food court" and his worry about a non-Western poet writing for an international audience – which in practical terms means a European and American audience – under the "pressure for linguistic fungibility" (p. 250). The question concerns both the authenticity of literary works, particularly lyric poetry, deeply rooted in a particular language and a national tradition, and the ways in which these works may be understood beyond their historical and cultural contexts.

In a way, Owen's skepticism of poetry in translation may be related to what Gayatri Spivak emphasizes as "singularity," that is, the need to "regionalize" a poet like Tagore in order to understand him in his specific linguistic and cultural background (p. 374, above). Spivak would certainly abhor the food court model of literary representation, and she is skeptical that students with special linguistic knowledge or cultural background in a multicultural class could speak of different literatures with any greater credibility than food court dishes could adequately represent different kinds of the world's cuisines. "Thinking of any international student as an authority on globality because of his/her identity is like thinking all Americans abroad are experts on Melville," says Spivak in a rare moment of absolute clarity out of her typically dense and difficult theoretical discourse (p. 373). But world literature is not taken hostage by translation or national literature specialists, and the idea is not to depend on translation with no knowledge of foreign languages. In his response to Spivak, Damrosch proposes "a *sliding scale* of language study" as a solution, that is, "a near-native grasp of one language" plus "a range of competence in several others" (p. 368).

The important step here is again to cross over the divide between European centers and non-European peripheries, and to acquire languages that are different not within one group, European, Asian, African, and so on, but across linguistic groups. As world literature covers more than the usual ground in linguistic and cultural diversity beyond individual capacities, translation becomes necessary and extremely important, and the often debated issue of translatability brings the

question of translation to a much deeper level than the usual kind of translation studies. As Susan Bassnett acknowledges, new and exciting ideas about translation are not coming from translation studies as such: "where we must turn today for the most innovative thinking about translation is to scholars who see themselves as comparatists, as postcolonialists, as world literature people" (p. 239, above). The tension in the concept of world literature between the local and the global, the national and the universal, differences and affinities, pushes the discussion of translation to a level of conceptualization that involves fundamental issues of thinking and communication across vast linguistic and cultural boundaries, issues of the possibility and practice of cross-cultural understanding and communication. In that sense, world literature engages translation in much more complicated theoretical discussions than ever before.

From Goethe and Marx to Casanova, Moretti, and Damrosch, the concept of world literature has been theorized mostly in the context of Western literary studies. Today, in world literature's tendency to go beyond Eurocentrism and any other ethnocentrism, the question necessarily arises: Is world literature to expand not only its coverage or reading materials to a global dimension, but also its critical and theoretical horizon to embrace the entire world, beyond the great East–West divide? Revathi Krishnaswamy raised that question against "a widespread assumption that theory is the product of a uniquely Western philosophical tradition. From this perspective, the non-West may be a source of exotic cultural production but cannot be a site of theory" (p. 135, above). She proposes the notion of "world literary knowledges" that "aims to go beyond inducting a few token non-Western greats into theory's hall of fame; rather, it asks us radically to re-vision the question of what counts as theory in the first place" (p. 136). Drawing on India's rich literary and critical traditions not only of Sanskrit poetics, but also of Tamil/Dravidian linguistics and poetics, the popular multilingual *bhakti* or devotional literatures, and Dalit literatures of the lower castes, Krishnaswamy provides three examples of how literary knowledge may emerge to deal with theoretical questions in different ways and different formulations. It is in this connection that we may appreciate the different notions of world literature presented by Tagore and Zheng Zhenduo, the more recent contributions by Karen Thornber on East Asian literary relations, or Ronit Ricci on literary networks in the Arabic world. In considering world literature in theory, we need to build a level playing field where the West meets the East as equal contributors, and the poetics of world literature should be a set of questions that inquire into the nature of language and expression, meaning and understanding, interpretation and aesthetic values, the origin of poetry and literature, the relationship between art and nature, and so on and so forth. The ways in which these questions get asked and answered are surely different in different literary traditions, but it is such basic questions and their answers that make up what literary theory is in world literature, with valuable insights richly elucidated by different examples and critical formulations.

Thus theory has the tendency to travel, to move from one place to another so that linkages and comparisons can be made in "contrapuntal juxtaposition" of literary

creations and cultural practices. Edward Said's classic essay on "Traveling Theory" has long pointed out the geopolitics in the transformations of literary theories in a globalized world that no longer conforms to the simple structure of European metropolitan centers and non-European peripheries. When theoretical concepts travel to a new cultural and political environment, Said argues, they will necessarily encounter resistance as "an inevitable part of acceptance."[12] Mechanical application of a theoretical notion in a new environment is thus always infertile; only adaptation and accommodation will bear fruits that are nurtured by the rich soil in which it has taken root. In that sense, world literature will never be the same everywhere it is studied. As Lawall observes with regard to world literature anthologies, "it is unlikely that any global perspective can be truly decentered, providing equal representation and a neutral framework."[13] That is to say, world literature in practice is always localized, with different works selected for study and critical comment, different issues addressed in different cultural and theoretical perspectives and with different interests.

World literature is thus always a concept that changes in response to local needs and contexts. At the same time, the competitiveness and highly selective nature of works that achieve a secure place within world literature yield a relatively stable set of canonical works from the world's different literary traditions. In that sense, world literature is also a productive way back to literature itself, a way to counter the moving away from literature in much of the discourse of literary theory and cultural studies in recent decades. The conceptual openness or flexibility of world literature, and the dynamic mix of new entries from previously neglected regions along with the ongoing relative stability of major literary works, constitute the strength and vitality of world literature as an exciting field with new possibilities for literary studies, and that may be the secret of the undeniable ascendance and success of world literature in our world today.

Notes

1 John Pizer, "Johann Wolfgang von Goethe: Origins and Relevance of *Weltliteratur*," in Theo D'haen, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir, eds., *The Routledge Companion to World Literature* (London: Routledge, 2012), 3–11 (3).

2 Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, *Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. John Gearey, trans. Ellen von Nardroff and Ernest H. Nardroff (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 207.

3 Goethe, *Essays on Art and Literature*, 208.

4 Claudio Guillén, *The Challenge of Comparative Literature*, trans. Cola Franzen (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993 [1985]), 39–40.

5 Monika Schmitz-Emans, "Richard Meyer's Concept of World Literature," trans. Mark Schmitt, in Theo D'haen, David Damrosch, and Djelal Kadir, eds., *The Routledge Companion to World Literature* (London: Routledge, 2012), 49–61 (50).

6 Aijad Ahmad, "*The Communist Manifesto* and 'World Literature'." *Social Scientist* 29:7–8 (Jul.–Aug. 2000), 3–30 (13).

7 Mads Rosendahl Thomsen, *Mapping World Literature: International Canonization and Transnational Literatures* (New York: Continuum, 2008), 13.

8 Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1967), 136–137.

9 It is only fair to point out, however, that Meltzl was well aware of the problem of focusing purely on European literature, as he criticized August Koberstein for tracing the aubade to Wolfram von Eschenbach without knowing "the fact that Lieder of this type were sung eighteen centuries ago in China (as those contained in the *Shih Ching*) and are frequently found among the folksongs of modern peoples, for instance, the Hungarians" (p. 37, above).

10 Sarah Lawall, "The West and the Rest: Frames for World Literature," in David Damrosch, ed., *Teaching World Literature* (New York: MLA, 2009), 17–33 (21).

11 Stephen Owen, "The Anxiety of Global Influence: What Is World Poetry?" *New Republic* (Nov. 19, 1990), 28–32 (29).

12 Edward Said, *The World, the Text, and the Critic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983), 227.

13 Lawall, "The West and the Rest," 29.